

MEETING SUMMARY

Water Quality Parameter Assessment Team

February 25, 1998

10:00 AM - 12:30 PM

The Resources Building

16th Floor, Room 1603

Sacramento, CA 95814

PAT Members: Ted Roefs, G. Fred Lee, Patricia Dunn, Bill Crooks, Brian Finlayson, Inge Werner, Stephen Murrill, Lynda Smith, Elaine Archibald, Tom Grovhoug, J.P. Cativiela, Chris Foe

CALFED Team: Judy Heath, Rick Woodard, Sarah Holmgren, Tanya Matson, Dale Flowers, Ted Way

Others: Marc Carpenter (Westlands Water District), Gail Louis (USEPA), Tom Maurer (USFWS)

Please note that the following summary provides an overview of the key topics discussed at the meeting. It is not meant as a verbatim transcript.

Introduction - Judy Heath

Judy began the meeting by asking all those present to introduce themselves. Judy explained that the purpose of the meeting was to resolve some of the issues raised at the last PAT meeting on January 28, 1998, regarding carbofuran, the membership of the PAT, and the status of pending requests for addition or deletion to the CALFED Water Quality Parameters of Concern List. Judy also provided a short review of the recommendations made by the PAT at the January 28, 1998, meeting.

Resolution of Issues From Last PAT Meeting - Sarah Holmgren

Sarah referred PAT members to the meeting handouts. She explained that some of the handouts were updated meeting materials for addition to the PAT Meeting Materials binders. An updated *Table of Contents* was provided to replace the *Table of Contents* provided to the PAT on January 28, 1998.

Geographic Scope

Sarah explained that pursuant to the request of the PAT at its last meeting on January 28, 1998, CALFED staff had reviewed the January 28, 1998 versions of the *Map of the CALFED Bay-Delta Program Programmatic EIS/EIR Study Area* and the *Description of the CALFED Bay-Delta Program Programmatic EIS/EIR Study Area* for consistency with the January 12, 1998, CALFED Draft Programmatic EIS/EIR. She noted that as a result of that review, minor edits were made and reflected in the February 25, 1998 versions of these documents. The PAT should replace the January 25, 1998 versions of these documents with the February 25, 1998 versions in their binders.

PAT Membership Representation

Sarah explained that in response to the PAT's recommendation on January 28, 1998, the membership of the PAT had been reviewed to ensure representation of all water quality interests.

She directed the team's attention to a handout entitled *Water Quality Expertise on the CALFED Water Quality Parameter Assessment Team* which grouped PAT members into the five water quality use categories (environmental, agricultural, urban, recreational, and industrial) identified in the goal of the Water Quality Program. She noted that each PAT member had been contacted to confirm his/her placement into one of the five categories. She also noted that certain water quality use categories such as recreation and industrial water use were not as well represented on the PAT as agriculture and urban water uses.

She also indicated that the *Parameter Assessment Team Membership Directory* provided to the PAT on January 25, 1998 had been updated to reflect the loss of two members: Perri Standish-Lee (she asked to be removed due to other commitments) and Bill Alsop (he has moved to Massachusetts). She mentioned that PAT members should replace the January 28, 1998 version of the *Parameter Assessment Team Membership Directory* with the February 25, 1998 version in their binders.

Comments Made

- The category "Environmental" is not included as a beneficial use in the Porter-Cologne Act.
- Legal definitions of the beneficial use categories should be provided.
- Human health is not a beneficial use - drinking water is a beneficial use.
- Since all water bodies do not have the same beneficial uses, perhaps the CALFED beneficial use categories should be referred to as "Areas of Concern."
- The environmental and recreational categories could encompass many of the same uses. More specific categories such as "Fish and Wildlife" should be adopted.
- Footnote each of the five categories to indicate which official/legal beneficial use categories it encompasses

Judy Heath indicated that the purpose of the Parameter Assessment Team Membership Directory was to analyze the current membership of the PAT to ensure fair representation of all interests with respect to water quality. She further explained that since the PAT is a volunteer group, participation had not been solicited in the past; however, if the PAT would like to make recommendations for additional participants, CALFED staff would consider expansion of the list. Judy also indicated that in order to maintain the dynamics of a small working group, the list should be limited to a manageable number. Currently there are 18 members on the PAT.

PAT RECOMMENDATIONS

It was recommended that a more full representation of interests could occur by adding the following:

- **California Farm Bureau or Western Crop Protection Association**
- **Mining Interests**
- **San Luis-Delta Mendota Water Authority**

- Clean Water Action
- DeltaKeeper
- Brent Graham, Tulare Lake Basin Water Storage District
- J.G. Boswell Company

Ammonia

Sarah explained that in response to the PAT's recommendation on January 28, 1998, water quality values for un-ionized ammonia had been compiled and summarized for review by the PAT. She directed the team's attention to a handout entitled *Water Quality Targets for Un-ionized Ammonia for Review by the Parameter Assessment Team on February 25, 1998* which summarized un-ionized water quality values from the USEPA and San Francisco Regional Water Quality Control Board. Judy indicated that these targets were peer reviewed by Chris Foe, Regional Water Quality Control Board. She asked the team to confirm whether these targets were the numbers they were recommending for inclusion into the table of Water Quality Targets for the CALFED Water Quality Program.

Comments Made

- The table should specify ammonia as NH_3 .
- The criteria of Region 2 should be referenced as mg/L.
- The table should include 1993 USEPA updated ammonia criteria.

PAT RECOMMENDATION

The Water Quality Targets for Un-ionized Ammonia table should be further refined based on the above recommendations before presentation to the Water Quality Technical Group.

Parameters of Concern Categorization

Sarah explained that in response to the PAT's recommendation on January 28, 1998, parameters of concern had been grouped into the five water use categories (environmental, agricultural, industrial, urban, and recreational). She directed the team's attention to a handout entitled *CALFED Water Quality Program Parameters of Concern Organized by Beneficial Uses*. Sarah indicated that some parameters of concern were listed under more than one category.

Comments Made

- Pathogens should be listed under the environment category.
- pH is listed as "pH (Alkalinity as CaCO_3)"; however alkalinity and pH are two different parameters of concern and should be listed as such.
- pH and Alkalinity as CaCO_3 should be listed under the environment category.

Overview of Draft PAT Policy - Judy Heath

Judy presented an overview of the draft PAT Policy and provided the PAT members with written copies. The PAT draft policy covers membership, function, structure of the PAT, the process for adding or deleting parameters of concern, the process for developing target levels, and the role of the PAT in the implementation phase of the CALFED Water Quality Program.

Membership

The PAT is a voluntary technical group made up of members with technical expertise covering a variety of interests. The membership may fluctuate based upon recommendations from the Water Quality Technical Group or CALFED management. The current list of PAT members was referenced.

Functions

The functions of the PAT include:

1. Proposes or receives recommendations to add or delete water quality parameters of concern to the CALFED Program.
2. Gathers or receives scientific evidence regarding environmental and human health impacts of proposed parameters of concern. Maintains awareness of recent scientific literature pertaining to CALFED water quality interests.
3. Provides scientific evaluations to determine whether additions or deletions should be made to the list of water quality parameters of concern to CALFED, and submits recommendations to the Water Quality Technical Group.
4. Makes recommendations to the Water Quality Technical Group on water quality goals, objectives, or target levels for new parameters of concern, the attainment of which will satisfactorily reduce or eliminate negative impacts on beneficial uses of waters of the Bay-Delta estuary, and upon species inhabiting the estuary.
5. Recommends priorities for implementing corrective actions based on scientific evaluation of the degree to which beneficial uses are affected by parameters of concern. The relative practicality and cost effectiveness of implementing corrective actions will be considered.
6. Evaluates attainment of water quality targets for implementation of CALFED water quality actions.

Judy stated that at the previous January 28, 1998 PAT meeting, it was the consensus of the PAT that, as a group, the PAT should not become involved in the regulatory processes of other agencies; however, CALFED may exchange newly developed information with other agencies as the program evolves. Judy further explained that, as the Water Quality Program develops, other subgroups of the Water Quality Technical Group similar to the PAT, but with different functions, may be formed to provide recommendations to CALFED.

Relationship to other Water Quality Program Activities

Judy showed the relationship of the PAT to the Water Quality Technical Group and to the CALFED Bay-Delta Program. She also indicated that two activities are being planned that will need to be coordinated with the PAT: (1) the formation of an Implementation Technical Group, which will design, analyze, and implement water quality actions, and (2) the formation of a Scientific Review Panel, which will provide scientific review for planning and implementation. Judy mentioned that comments regarding the functions and activities of these two proposed groups will be solicited at the February 25, 1998 Water Quality Technical Group meeting.

Process for Adding or Deleting a Parameter of Concern

The process for adding or deleting a parameter of concern is being standardized through the assistance of the PAT:

1. A formal written request is made to the CALFED Bay-Delta Program.
2. The formal request is determined to comply with CALFED guidelines for adding or deleting a parameter of concern.
3. The party requesting the addition or deletion of a parameter of concern attends a PAT meeting to present the request, and to provide scientific support for the proposal.
4. The PAT will evaluate proposals and will formulate recommendations to the Water Quality Technical Group for addition or removal of CALFED water quality parameters of concern.
5. The Water Quality Technical Group will consider the proposal and formulate recommendations for consideration by CALFED management.
6. CALFED management considers the Water Quality Technical Group recommendations and makes a determination.
7. Persons proposing addition or removal of water quality parameters of concern can appeal a decision.
8. Decisions of CALFED management will be final.

Comments Made

- To clearly evaluate an appeals process, further information regarding the CALFED decision-making process should be provided to the PAT.
- Any appeal should be made to the Water Quality Program staff in order to receive appropriate further review.
- The PAT functions as a working group and the addition of an appeals process brings greater significance to the decisions of the PAT, and would give the appearance of an official capacity.

The CALFED decision-making process involves the following: (1) Water Quality Program staff receive recommendations and comments from agencies and stakeholders; (2) A policy coordination team which consists of mid-level management reviews the recommendations; (3) a higher level management team reviews the recommendations; and (4) a Policy Group which consists of individuals such as Secretary of Resources Wheeler reviews the recommendations, makes a decision and refers that decision back to CALFED staff for incorporation.

It was noted by Rick Woodard that the parameter of concern list is submitted as a package, along with other Water Quality Program information, for this decision-making process.

Judy stated that the appeals process is still in the development stage and the comments of the PAT will be taken into consideration as the development of the PAT policy continues.

Potential Parameters of Concern List

The draft policy also includes information regarding potential parameters of concern. This category was developed by the PAT where scientific information is still being developed but

where there is enough information to indicate a potential concern. Judy explained that a parameter placed in this category means that the parameter will be tracked periodically for future development of needed information. A parameter on the potential parameter of concern list is not a candidate for a water quality implementation action until it is added to the parameter of concern list.

Comments Made

- The potential parameters of concern list should be reviewed once a year to determine whether or not the basis for its listing still exists.
- The individual or organization recommending the addition of the potential parameter of concern should provide the PAT with a yearly update of new developments.

Significance of Parameter of Concern List

Judy explained the significance of the parameter of concern list. A listed parameter of concern is a candidate for evaluation which may lead to possible investments in water quality actions. The evaluation process includes a pre-feasibility study. The listing means that CALFED is committed to the evaluations necessary to determine the feasibility and priorities through which CALFED water quality investments are made.

CALFED Water Quality Targets

Judy referred the PAT to the list of references in the PAT binder which serves as the source for recommending target levels. She explained that target levels recommended for parameters of concern are designed to provide a yardstick to measure the success of implementing water quality actions. Where appropriate state or federal regulations exist, CALFED target levels are based on regulatory limits. Targets are not enforceable under the CALFED Bay-Delta Program.

Comments Made

- Is there consideration for when a parameter or action is determined to be unnecessary?

The CALFED adaptive management process allows for altering or modifying a direction based upon obtaining new information.

Resolution of Carbofuran Request - Stephen Murrill

Per the request of the PAT on January 28, 1998 a copy of the California Department of Pesticide Regulation's data on carbofuran entitled *CARBO.XLS: Carbofuran Surface Water Sampling Results Contained in the Department of Pesticide Regulation's Surface Water Database as of February 18, 1998* was provided to the PAT for review. In addition, Mr. Murrill discussed his request for the deletion of carbofuran from the CALFED Water Quality Parameter of Concern List.

Mr. Murrill reiterated his comments from the January 28, 1998 PAT meeting that the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board had recently removed carbofuran from the 303(d) list for the Sacramento River. However, he noted that carbofuran remains on the 303(d) list for the Colusa Basin Drain because it exceeds the performance goal in the Central Valley Regional

Water Quality Control Board's Basin Plan. Mr. Murrill presented a summary of the 1987 to 1997 peak annual concentrations for the PAT's information. In addition, he mentioned that carbofuran is currently being addressed through the Department of Pesticide Regulation Rice Pesticide Management Program.

Comments Made

- Carbofuran currently does not pose a threat to Colusa Basin Drain.
- Carbofuran concentrations in the Colusa Basin Drain exceed the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board's performance goal. However, a performance goal is not a water quality objective.
- The Colusa Basin Drain still remains on the 303(d) list because it does have beneficial uses for habitat according to the Central Valley RWQCB Basin Plan.
- The existing data only covers acute testing; chronic toxicity testing should be undertaken.
- Additional toxicity information including ambient water quality data are needed.
- More time is needed to fully review the DPR data on carbofuran.

PAT RECOMMENDATION

Mr. Murrill's request for deletion of carbofuran as a parameter of concern should be discussed at the next PAT meeting.

Additional carbofuran data should be provided to the PAT for review at least one week prior to the next PAT meeting.

Status of Pending Requests for Addition/Deletion - Sarah Holmgren

Sarah explained the handout entitled *Status of Pending Requests for Additions or Deletions to the List of Parameters of Concern for the CALFED Water Quality Program*. This list was provided to the PAT pursuant to its January 28, 1998 recommendation that it be informed of the status of requests. Sarah also indicated that the original written comments of the individuals proposing additions or deletions to the list of parameters of concern were included in Section 6 of the PAT Meeting Materials binders.

Finalization of PAT Recommendations and Selection of PAT Representative for the Water Quality Technical Group Meeting - Sarah Holmgren

Sarah briefly reviewed the recommendations of the PAT resulting from the January 28, 1998 PAT meeting and asked if there were any objections regarding the presentation of these recommendations to the afternoon meeting of the Water Quality Technical Group. No objections were made. The group agreed that Sarah Holmgren would present the PAT recommendations to the Water Quality Technical Group.

Wrap-up - Judy Heath

Judy thanked the Parameter Assessment Team members for their participation in the CALFED Water Quality Program. She indicated that the comments of the PAT draft policy would be taken into consideration as policy development continues. In addition, she mentioned that the PAT recommendations to the PAT membership would be acted on.

As a final action, handout materials from the San Francisco Regional Water Quality Control Board meeting on February 18, 1998 were distributed. The purpose of this meeting was to review the 303(d) list of impaired waterbodies. The PAT was informed that the table of impaired water bodies in the PAT binder is continually updated to reflect revisions to the 303(d) list.